Attachment to Interview Summary

FAX
DATE: April 25, 2008
PTO IDENTIFIER: Application Number 09/981,644-Conf. #7020 Patent Number
Inventor: Jason Lango
MESSAGE TO: Examiner Benjamin A. Ailes
FAX NUMBER: (571) 273-3899
FROM: PERKINS COJE LLP
Susan L. Baka for Jordan M. Becker (Patent Attorney)
PHONE: (650) 838-4398
Attorney Dkt. #: 67272-8045.US01
PAGES (Including Cover Sheet):3
Please see the attached Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form and attached Brief Description of Arguments to be presented.
7 receipt of this transmission is in error, please notify this firm immediately by collect call to sender at (650) 838-4300 and send the original transmission to us by return mail the address below.
This transmission is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or duplication of this transmission by someone other

## **PERKINS COIE LLP**

than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited.

101 Jefferson Drive, Menlo Park, California 94025-1114 **Telephone:** (650) 838-4300 **Facsimile:** (650) 838-4350

PTQL-413A(10-07) Approved for use through 04/30/2008。OMB 0851-0031 Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

	Applicant	Initiated Interview	Request For	m	
pplication No.: 09 examiner: Benjamin	9/981,644-Conf. A. Ailes	First Named Applicant: Art 2142	J Status of Applica	ason Lango tion: Per	nding
entative Participants:					
•	er	(2)		_	
		(4)			
roposed Date of Interv			1 Time: 2:00		·n)
•				<del></del> '	•
Type of Interview Reque 1) X Telephonic	ested: (2) Personal	(3) Video Co	onference		
Exhibit To Be Shown or I yes, provide brief desc	_	YEŞ X NO			
, yes, provide british		Issues To Be Disc	ussed		<u></u>
Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Rej. 103	79,86,90	Markowitz/Pinckney			
(2)					
(3)					
(4)		<u> </u>			
Continuation Sh		A			
Brief Description of Ar See attached.	guments to be Pres	entea:			
see allached.					
An interview was condi	ucted on the above-	identified application	•	4	
(see MPEP 8713.01).		cant and submitted to the e			
This application will r interview. Therefore, as soon as possible.	oot be delayed from applicant is advis	n issue because of applicant ed to file a statement of the	t's failure to subn substance of this	interview (37 C	FR 1.133(b))
	NN				
Applicant/Appli	cant's Representati	ve Signature	Examin	cr/SPE Signature	2
· · ·	me of Applicant or	Representative	•		
Registrat	1, 602 ion Number, if app	licable			

09/981,644

## Brief Description of Arguments to be presented:

Applicants have carefully reviewed the cited references and the latest contentions in the present Office Action. Applicants find that contrary to the Office Action's contentions:

- 1) There is no disclosure in the cited references of both a protocol dependent subsystem and a protocol independent subsystem. In particular, Pinkney discloses a protocol dependent subsystem, not a protocol independent subsystem. Likewise, Markowitz discloses, if anything, a protocol dependent subsystem, but not a protocol independent subsystem.
- 2) There is no disclosure in the cited references of a protocol <u>independent</u> subsystem that stores data in <u>streaming media protocol specific form</u>.
- 3) There is no disclosure in the cited references of a protocol <u>dependent</u> subsystem that includes <u>a plurality of streaming media encoders</u> to support a plurality of streaming media protocols. Different bandwidth encodings as disclosed in Markowitz does not imply the use of different streaming media protocols.
- 4) There is no disclosure in the cited references of a protocol <u>independent</u> subsystem controlling the pace of <u>delivery</u> of streaming media data.